

activities of the Forest Service. We shall be glad to work with the association as with other groups on consideration of specific problems or specific proposals for solutions of problems in connection with appeal procedures under the present regulation or any possible modification of that regulation which is in line with authorized practices of Federal administration.

PROPOSAL NO. 4

This is a request for a new timber sale contract form.

The last major revision of the national forest timber sale contract form was completed in 1954 after lengthy discussion with industry groups culminating in a full week's conference with representatives of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association and the American Pulpwood Association. There have been few changes since that time. The basic contract is essentially the same one which the industry reviewed 8 years ago.

We are entirely willing to review the present timber sale contract form with purchaser groups for the objective of clarifying or otherwise finding better solutions for the items which disturb the association.

Contract wording is a detailed matter which should be studied by experts representing both buyers and sellers of timber. We do not consider it advisable to set up a working committee composed exclusively of attorneys. We shall be glad to have representatives of the Forest Service and of the Department's Office of the General Counsel meet with representatives of the association who are concerned with both operating and legal considerations. This initial group could proceed to develop a plan for prosecuting this proposal.

If the association wishes, and the General Accounting Office is willing, we would be pleased to submit the contract form for its review. However, we regard the choice of terms and conditions in such contract to be for agency determination.

This analysis has been prepared with recognition of the difficult market conditions during the past 2 years. The changes in timber sale administration made to date, together with action proposed by this memorandum, constitute our attempts to take constructive action to the extent possible. This action will not close consideration of the problems of timber pricing and timber sale for we will continually search for improvement in this important segment of the national forest program.

EDWARD P. CLIFF.

HAWAII SURGEONS HELP SAMOA

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, one of the most urgent problems faced by our friends in American Samoa is to obtain the services of badly needed professional people in various fields of endeavor. Recently, members of the Hawaii Medical Association volunteered to help remedy the shortage of medical help in Samoa. Surgeon members of the Hawaii Medical Association have taken turns serving in Samoa until a permanent surgeon can be found to take a position there. The action of the Hawaii Medical Association and its members is in the best tradition of the medical profession. I am proud to call the attention of my colleagues to this generous action, which is an important step toward recognition of our longstanding responsibilities to the loyal and friendly people of American Samoa.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the American Medical Association News of May 28, telling of the

action of the members of the Hawaii Medical Association, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of the Hawaii Medical Association were warmly praised by the Governor of American Samoa for their volunteer efforts to ease a critical physician shortage on the island.

In a letter to the American Medical Association, Gov. H. Rex Lee pointed out that for several months Samoa's Medical Services Department has been unable to recruit a surgeon.

MEDICAL SOCIETY HELPS

The Hawaii Medical Association, Governor Lee said, learned of the situation and arranged with some of its surgeon members to go to Samoa and provide "a very desperately needed service."

Through April, four Hawaii surgeons had served on the island for a month each. The first volunteer was Thomas H. Richert, M.D., who described the situation as "a real emergency."

Dr. Richert was followed to the island by M.D.'s C. V. Waite, Frederick B. Warshauer and Edward W. Boone.

SERVICE AND SKILL

"These men," Governor Lee wrote, "have given their skills without compensation and at a considerable financial loss to themselves."

"We feel," the Governor continued, "that in these times when the medical profession is frequently criticized for its material approach, such generosity and devotion to humanity should be made known to the lay public."

Arrangements have been made to continue sending volunteer surgeons to Samoa until a permanent surgeon is obtained. HMA also plans to send specialists in various areas of medicine to conduct clinics and seminars.

FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, entitled, "Freedom Academy Has Merit," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for Sunday, June 10. This article in somewhat abbreviated form also appeared in the Washington Post for Sunday, June 10. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the Drummond article as it appeared in the Washington Post.

With respect to the Washington Post I might add with gratitude that the Freedom Academy seems to be making some progress, for an earlier column by Mr. Drummond, describing in detail the purposes of the Freedom Academy, was excised in toto by the Post.

This most recent article by Mr. Drummond deals with the negative views on the Freedom Academy bill—S. 822—which have just been communicated to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the Department of State. In his concise, yet always thorough, style, Mr. Drummond points out that the negative views of the Department of State reflect a fundamental misunderstanding of the purposes and objectives envisioned for the Freedom Academy.

Of all the agencies of Government none should be more interested than the Department of State in the upgrading and improvement of our total research and training efforts in the multiple and complex disciplines of nonmilitary conflict. This is the task proposed for the Freedom Academy in S. 822, a bill sponsored by 12 Members of this body whose basic philosophies span our two-party political spectrum. It is, indeed, unfortunate that the Department of State, which stands to be the prime beneficiary of the Freedom Academy bill's proposed program of research and training should resist the adoption of this legislation. Such negativism is especially discouraging at a time when our country so badly needs positive thinking in its Department of State.

I heartily concur with Mr. Drummond's expressed hope that Senator FULBRIGHT and Congressman WALTER will not be dissuaded from holding public hearings on the Freedom Academy bill by reason of State's adverse views which are premised on a serious misunderstanding of the proposal for action embodied in S. 822.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 10, 1962]

NEGATIVE GOOD NEWS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The bipartisan Senate sponsors of the Freedom Academy bill have received some bad news—and a little good news—from the State Department.

The bad news is that the State Department does not want Congress to pass the bill creating a Freedom Academy which would do independent research on methods of waging the cold war and would provide special training for people, inside and outside the Government, to conduct the nonmilitary side of the conflict more effectively.

Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, in a 3-page, 1,200-word letter, suffocates the Freedom Academy idea with praise for its purposes and with a "no" in every paragraph, saying in effect: "Hands off, we're doing just fine."

On the other hand, the State Department, worried about the public support which the Freedom Academy is winning and apparently in an effort to blunt the case for it, announces that it is preparing to add a 5-week course in cold-war techniques to the regular curriculum of the Foreign Service Institute.

I call this negative good news.

It is good because by it the State Department admits the need for doing more to provide cold-war training.

It is negative because it shows that the Department is doing nothing adequate to provide this training. A 5-week course thrown together by an improvised faculty for a few Government officials is like sending the marines to Guadalcanal after preparing them for a game of ping pong.

Thus the State Department concedes that what the Freedom Academy would do is needed and moves to meet that need inadequately—woefully inadequately.

Perhaps it is understandable that the State Department should resist the Freedom Academy proposal. Every arm of the Government is jealous over its traditional prerogatives. There is a built-in bureaucratic resistance to anything that might upset the status quo—or even appear to do so.

Assistant Secretary Dutton's letter shows that the State Department is extremely sensitive over its jurisdictional authority as the President's sole agent in foreign affairs. I think it is overly sensitive and that Mr. Dutton's rebuff to the sponsors of the Freedom Academy bill rests on a misreading and a misunderstanding of the project.

Fragments of the problem are being dealt with by research specialists today. The need is to draw together under one roof the most qualified experts to undertake coordinated and sustained research to provide, not a cursory course for a few weeks, but a complete, specialized, and thorough training.

The Freedom Academy would not be operational, would not undercut the State Department. The service academies—the Army, Navy, Air Force, and National War Colleges—all undertake continuous studies of military strategy. This research is available to the services; it produces new ideas and breaks new ground, but the service academies do not undercut the Pentagon nor take operational responsibility from the Chiefs of Staff.

The proposed Freedom Academy would not dilute nor impair the authority of the State Department any more than the Naval Academy dilutes or impairs the authority of the Navy. It would strengthen the State Department by nourishing the insight and the expertness of all in Government dealing with the cold war.

I should think that Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and Representative FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, the respective chairmen of the Senate and House committees to which the Freedom Academy bill has been assigned, would not accept the State Department's negative attitude.

[From the Washington Post, June 10, 1962]
EDUCATION FOR THE COLD WAR—FREEDOM ACADEMY HAS MERIT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The bipartisan Senate sponsors of the Freedom Academy bill have received some bad news—and a little good news—from the State Department.

The bad news is that the State Department does not want Congress to pass the bill creating a Freedom Academy which would do independent research on methods of waging the cold war and would provide special training for people, inside and outside the Government, to conduct the nonmilitary side of the conflict more effectively.

Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, in a 3-page, 1,200-word letter suffocates the Freedom Academy idea with praise for its purposes and with a "no" in every paragraph, saying in effect: "hands off, we're doing just fine."

On the other hand, the State Department, worried by the public support which the Freedom Academy is winning and apparently in an effort to blunt the case for it, announces that it is preparing to add a 5-week course in cold war techniques to the regular curriculum of the Foreign Service Institute.

I call this negative good news.

It is good because by it the State Department admits the need for doing more to provide specialized cold war training.

It is negative because it shows that the Department is doing nothing adequate to provide this training. A 5-week course thrown together by an improvised faculty for a few Government officials is like sending the marines to Guadalcanal after preparing them for a game of Ping-pong.

Perhaps it is understandable that the State Department should resist the Freedom Academy proposal. Every arm of the Government is jealous over its traditional prerogatives. There is a built-in bureaucratic resistance to anything that might upset the status quo or even appear to do so.

Dutton's letter shows that the State Department is extremely sensitive over its jurisdictional authority as the President's sole agent in foreign affairs. I think it is overly sensitive and that Dutton's rebuff to the sponsors of the Freedom Academy bill rests on a misreading and a misunderstanding of the project.

The proposed Freedom Academy would not dilute nor impair the authority of the State Department any more than the Naval Academy dilutes or impairs the authority of the Navy. It would strengthen the State Department by nourishing the insight and the expertness of all in Government dealing with the cold war.

I should think that Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and Representative FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, the respective chairmen of the Senate and House committees to which the Freedom Academy bill has been assigned, would not accept the State Department's negative attitude.

TRIBUTE TO GRADUATING CLASS OF GLEN LAKE COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL, MICH.

MR. HART. Mr. President, a trip to Washington has been a tradition for the graduating class of Glen Lake Community High School, not far from Traverse City, Mich.

This year, however, the class is not coming because 6 weeks ago one of its members was discovered to have cancer.

So, instead, 33 graduates decided to give their entire class fund—\$700—to the stricken boy, 17-year-old Duane Richardson.

Mr. President, this school district is not a rich one. It is questionable whether many of these youngsters will be able to make the trip on their own in the near future. Yet I understand these youngsters made the decision almost spontaneously.

Graduating classes come to Washington because it is an excellent place to grasp firsthand a little of our history and to learn something about the spirit of sacrifice that has made this Nation a great one.

So perhaps by giving up their trip, these youngsters at Glen Lake Community High School have proven that they have already learned the greatest lesson, that of charity. We are very proud of them and I take this means of telling the people of the country about them.

LOCAL RESIDENTS OPPOSE NEW DAM IN KANSAS

MR. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last week I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee to outline in detail why it would be a serious mistake to go ahead with the proposed Glen Elder dam and irrigation project in Kansas.

In my statement I made three main points:

First, The Glen Elder project has not been properly authorized. Neither the Interior or Public Works Committees, in the House of Representatives or the Senate, has ever considered this project in detail. The only previous congressional reference to it was a single line in the 1944 omnibus Pick-Sloan authoriza-

tion, where it is listed along with 325 other projects. Since that date the project has been altered substantially. In the intervening 18 years the economic context in which a project evaluation must be made has also changed completely.

Second, Irrigation provided by the Glen Elder project will lead to a substantial increase in feed grain surpluses. The official description of the project indicates that 13,000 of the newly irrigated acres will be used to grow grain sorghums, with a crop value at current prices of over \$1 million per year. I consider it incomprehensible that we should provide funds to increase grain sorghum production at the same time Congress is trying to deal with a feed grain surplus amounting to \$3.3 billion, including over 700 million bushels of sorghums.

Third, The economic justification for the Glen Elder project is dubious, which further emphasizes the need for full congressional review and authorization. Its overall benefit-cost ratio is barely above one. Modifications in criteria suggested by the President's Water Resources Council could lower the ratio to less than one. Its financial feasibility is also doubtful. Some \$4 million of the \$17 million cost of the irrigation features will be repaid by the users over a 50-year period. The other \$13 million will not be repaid until about the year 2060, when revenues from the power sales of the Missouri River basin will become available. Even though the initial costs will eventually be paid in this way, the general taxpayer will bear the substantial imputed interest cost, an estimated \$50 million, as well as the cost of acquiring the surplus grain sorghums.

I have now received a number of letters from citizens of Kansas who live in the area immediately surrounding the Glen Elder project. These are people who have firsthand knowledge of the alleged benefits attributed to the project.

It is very interesting to note that they strongly oppose it. Their letters included press clippings from the Beloit, Kans., Daily Call and other Kansas papers which further document the local opposition. One item in the paper indicates that the opposition goes back some 10 years, since in 1952 nearly 100 farmers living in the area appeared to protest against the project.

I ask unanimous consent that certain letters from Kansas residents with names deleted be printed in the RECORD at this point, along with the attached newspaper clippings.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 8, 1962.

DEAR SIR: I'm surely glad somebody had nerve enough to speak out against this dam. I live about 30 miles down the river from Glen Elder. We get all the rainfall we need maybe not at the right time nor the right amount at once—if we had irrigation you take the water in your turn maybe we get a big rain what then? Our valley is too narrow—it would take years of leveling by the time farmers were ready to irrigate they would have lost the land in expense. The floods are a matter of cause and effect. They grade up the roads and highways so what?